UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,733	07/21/2006	Atsushi Matsutani	293205US8PCT	5995
	7590 06/08/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			PEREZ, ANGELICA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2618		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/586,733	MATSUTANI, ATSU	ISHI	
Examiner	Art Unit		

	ANGELICA M. PEREZ	2618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see NO¯v);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11-24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Nay A. Maung/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618	/A. M. P./ Examiner, Art Unit 2618		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (A) "With regard to Claim 11, at least Figure 9 shows that client terminal 2 determines in step SP4 "if a condition relative to a predetermined time period is met." With regard to Claim 14, at least paragraph 83 of the publication of the specification describes the noted features of this claim. With regard to Claims 15 and 22, it is respectfully submitted that Figure 9 shows that server PS receives and transmits the claimed information. Finally, with respect to Claim 16, examples in the specification of the claimed predetermined time intervals are as noted in the outstanding Office Action."

In resposne to argument (A), the examiner has reviewed and accepted the explanations. The claims will be interpreted considering the explanations presented in the Remarks/Arguments.

(B) "...statement of relevancy. Accordingly, PTO forms 1449s indicating these references as considered are respectfully requested with the next office communication."

In response to argument (B), the examiner is providing initialed 1449s.

(C) "...proposed combination of references is not sufficient to render the claims primafacie obvious. Consequently, Claims 18 and 20 are patentable over Misawa in view of Tsubokura."

In resposne to argument (C), the examiner would like to explain where the combination is proper, since past information can be used to plan future broadcat, as presented in the cited references and in claims 18 and 20. There are not considerable hardware changes, but few software changes that can lead to the same results. In addition, it is commercially desirable to consider past broadcast in order to make decisions concerning future broadcast programming.